

## **REMARKS**

Applicants thank the Examiner for his careful review of the application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present case in view of the following remarks. Claims 20-73 are currently pending. Claims 20, 28, 34, 42, 48, 56, 62, and 70 have been amended. The title has been amended. No new matter has been added.

Applicants request an interview with the Examiner by telephone prior to further examination of the present application. Applicants request that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to arrange for such an interview at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

### **Specification**

The Examiner has objected to the title of the invention as not descriptive. Applicants have amended the title consistent with Examiner's comments from "Method and Apparatus for Mobile Personal Radar" to "Computerized System for Mobile Personal Radar." This amendment in no way is intended to alter the scope of the invention embodied in the present application.

### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102**

Claims 20-73 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Obradovich et al., US 6,529,824. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants have amended independent claims 20, 28, 34, 42, 48, 56, 62, and 70 to include a requirement that the server produces customized weather maps that are one of the multiple image types which the server is capable of generating. This is fully supported by the specification on at least pages 23 and 26-29. Specifically, the application discusses the server system generating images in formats recognizable by a variety of mobile client devices, whether they use 4-color, 8 bit, or 32 bit color graphics displays.

Obradovich does not discuss the image type of the weather maps received by the PCD, and does not discuss any formatting capabilities of a server system responding to the PCD requests. Hence, Obradovich does not disclose or suggest a server system that is capable of producing weather maps of multiple image types. Moreover, Obradovich provides no teaching that would have suggested the desirability of such a server feature, because the disclosure is focused solely on the client-side PCD.

For at least this reason, independent claims 20, 28, 34, 42, 48, 56, 62, and 70 are allowable over Obradovich. Therefore Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of these claims.


Claims 21-27 are dependent on currently amended claim 20. Claims 29-33 are dependent on currently amended claim 28. Claims 35-41 are dependent on currently amended claim 34. Claims 43-47 are dependent on currently amended claim 42. Claims 49-55 are dependent on currently amended claim 48. Claims 57-61 are dependent on currently amended claim 56. Claims 63-69 are dependent on currently amended claim 62. Claims 71-73 are dependent on currently amended claim 70. For at least these reasons, claims 21-27, 29-33, 35-41, 43-47, 49-55, 57-61, 63-69, and 71-73 are allowable as well. Therefore, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the dependent claims.

**Conclusion**

Claims 20-73 remain pending in the application. These claims are allowable for the reasons set forth above. This amendment is believed to be responsive to all points raised in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request prompt reconsideration, allowance, and passage of the application to issue. Should the Examiner have any remaining questions or concerns, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned by telephone at the number below to expeditiously resolve such concerns.

Respectfully submitted,

1/31/2005  
Date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Erik G. Swenson  
Reg. No. 45,147  
Merchant & Gould P.C.  
P. O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903  
(612) 332-5300

EGS:AJL:kf

